

CF0000110402

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH AT JABALPUR.

Misc. Petition No. 4893 /1993.

PETITIONERS : 1- Mahendra Pal Singh son of Shri Ranjeet Singh, Occupation : Contractor of C.S. 3, R/o Kharora, Tahsil & District - Raipur (MP).

2- Bhagat Singh son of Shri Gurucharan Singh, Occupation : Contractor of C.S. 3, R/o Civil Lines, Raipur (MP).

3- Naurangilal Yadav son of Shri Ramashankar Yadav, Occupation : Contractor of C.S. 3, R/o Station Road Bagbahra, district Raipur (MP).

4- Hardev Prasad son of Shri Baldeo Prasad Jaiswal, Occupation : Contractor of F.L.1, R/o 108 Kota Colony, Raipur (MP)

5- Trilok Singh son of Shri Sohan Singh, Occupation : Contractor F.L. 1, R/o Kharora, district Raipur (MP)

6- Ram Singh son of Shri Mahatram Singh, Occupation : Contractor F.L. 1, R/o Mahasamund (Bagbahara), district Raipur (MP).

7- Gurubhej Singh son of Shri Lal Singh, Occupation : Contractor F.L.1, R/o Kadar Chouk, Raipur (MP)

8- Bhuwanlal Dubey son of Shri Van Khandi Dubey, Occupation : Contractor F.L.1, R/o near Bus Stand, Kharora, district Raipur (MP).

9- M/s Narayan Associates, Indore through : Proprietor Iqbal Singh Bhatia son of Shri Harbansh Singh Bhatia, Occupation : Contractor C.S-3, R/o Tulsipur, Rajnandgaon (MP)

- Versus -

OATH COMMISSIONER
Ku N. K. KHAN
1-12-93
JABALPUR

RESPONDENTS : 1- State of Madhya Pradesh through : the Secretary, Department of Separate Revenue, Vallabh Bhavan, Bhopal.

2- The Collector (Excise) Raipur.

3- The District Excise Officer, Raipur.

4- The Collector (Excise) Durg.

5- The District Excise Officer, Durg.

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA .

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ..... WP 4893/03 सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	16.3.2005 Smt. S. Ghai, counsel for the petitioners. Shri Pankaj Shrivastava, P.L. for the State. The petitioners, who are the licensees in respect of sale of liquor for the excise year 93-94, have questioned the order Annexure P-7 whereby they were asked to pay consideration in 12 equal instalments. Further challenge of the petitioners is regarding order of closure of shops for more three days. Since this matter pertains to year 92-93 and license was granted for only one year, therefore, this matter has become infructuous. Accordingly, it is dismissed as having become infructuous. **Sd/-** **L.C. BHADOO** **Judge**	

(पीछे देखिये)